

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-10 are rejected under judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 2, 1, 2, 5, 5, 6 and 6, respectively of U.S. Patent No. 6,702,388 in view of Stewart.

Drawings

It is noted that no Patent Drawing Review (Form PTO-948) was received with the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant must assume that the drawings are acceptable as filed.

Double Patenting

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.321(c), a Terminal Disclaimer for claims 1-10 is submitted herewith. Acknowledgment of the receipt of this document is respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claim 2 and has amended claims 1, 3 and 4 of this application. It is believed that the amended claims specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Applicant's amended claim 1 comprises a combination of original claims 1 and 2, thus redrafting claim 2 in independent form. Applicant's amended claim 4 comprises a combination of original claims 1 and 4, thus redrafting claim 4 in independent form.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 16, 2005

By:



Bruce H. Troxell
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707